

Remarks

Claims 1-8, 10-21, 25, 27-32, 34, and 37-41 are now pending in this application. Applicants have amended claims 1, 4, 6, 10-14, 16-21, 25, 27-32, 34, 37, and 39-41 and cancelled claims 9, 22-24, 26, 33, 35 and 36 to clarify the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.83(a) and 1.84(p)(5). Applicants submit herewith one sheet of corrected drawings including Fig. 9, from which Applicants have deleted the reference characters L1, t1, and a1. Also, none of the pending claims recites a diffusion barrier or armouring. Therefore, Applicants submit that the drawings comply with 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.83(a) and 1.84(p)(5), and respectfully request withdrawal of the objections to the drawings.

Applicants have amended the dependency of the claims to ensure that antecedent basis exists for the phrase "prior to injection molding". Applicants have amended claim 28 to clarify "the material". Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objections to the claims.

The Examiner rejected claims 11, 28, 31, 40 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. Applicants have amended these claims to delete the term "preferably". Applicants have amended claims 40 and 41 to depend from method claim 25. Accordingly, Applicants submit that all pending claims comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and

respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Applicants submit that amended claims 40 and 41 also comply with 35 U.S.C. § 101, and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 9, 10, 25, 26, 31, 32, 40, and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. patent publication 2003/0142457 to Eriksson et al. The Examiner rejected claims 2, 3, 8, and 11-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eriksson et al.

Eriksson et al. does not disclose the invention recited in independent claims 1 or 25 since, among other things, Eriksson et al. does not disclose a power capacitor that includes protrusions that have a thickness and radial length such that the protrusions cool the capacitor. Rather, Eriksson et al. discloses a structure that includes a central axial channel running through each capacitor element. Forced cooling may be carried out through the central axial channel to facilitate cooling. On the other hand, the claimed invention includes a structure that can cool at least one capacitor element enclosed in at least one insulating medium that is in a state different from a liquid state within the working temperature interval of the capacitor. Protrusions for extending the creepage distance typically do not improve the cooling inside the housing. Eriksson et al. discloses a different solution to this problem.

In view of the above, Eriksson et al. does not disclose all elements of the invention recited in claims 1, 4, 9, 10, 25, 26, 31, 32, 40, and 41. Since Eriksson et al. does not disclose all elements

of the invention recited in claims 1, 4, 9, 10, 25, 26, 31, 32, 40, and 41, the invention recited in claims 1, 4, 9, 10, 25, 26, 31, 32, 40, and 41 is not properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). For an anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) no difference may exist between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure. *See Scripps Clinic and Research Foundation v. Genentech, Inc.*, 18 U.S.P.Q. 841 (C.A.F.C. 1984).

Along these lines, anticipation requires the disclosure, in a cited reference, of each and every recitation, as set forth in the claims. *See Hodosh v. Block Drug Co.*, 229 U.S.P.Q. 182 (Fed. Cir. 1986); *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 227 U.S.P.Q. 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *Orthokinetics, Inc. v. Safety Travel Chairs, Inc.*, 1 U.S.P.Q.2d 1081 (Fed. Cir. 1986); and *Akzo N.V. v. U.S. International Trade Commissioner*, 1 U.S.P.Q.2d 1081 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Eriksson et al. does not disclose the invention recited in claims 2, 3, 8, and 11-15 since, among other things, Eriksson et al. does not suggest a power capacitor that includes protrusions that have a thickness and radial length such that the protrusions cool the capacitor. Eriksson et al. discloses a structure that includes a central axial channel running through each capacitor element. Eriksson et al. only protrusions for protrusions that extend the creepage current. Therefore, Eriksson et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claims 2, 3, 8, and 11-15. Accordingly, the invention recited in claims 2, 3, 8, and 11-15 is not obvious in view of Eriksson et al. .Consequently Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The combination of Eriksson et al. and Ramarge et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claims 16-20, 27-29, and 34 since, among other things, the combination does not

suggest a power capacitor that includes protrusions that have a thickness and radial length such that the protrusions cool the capacitor. As noted above, Eriksson et al. does not suggest such protrusions. Additionally, Ramarge et al. does not suggest a structure that requires cooling. In fact, the term "cooling" does not appear anywhere in the disclosure of Ramarge et al. Additionally, Ramarge et al. only mentions the term "temperature" with respect to a silicone sheath.

It does not appear as if the structure suggested by Ramarge et al. requires cooling. Along these lines, Ramarge et al. does not suggest a power capacitor. Additionally, Ramarge et al. does not suggest a structure that includes capacitor elements that are enclosed in at least one insulating medium that is in a state different from a liquid state within a working temperature interval of the capacitor. Therefore, not only does Ramarge et al. not overcome the above-described deficiencies of Eriksson et al., there is no motivation to combine the references.

Accordingly, the combination of Eriksson et al. and Ramarge et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claims 2, 3, 8, and 11-15. It follows that the invention recited in claims 2, 3, 8, and 11-15 is not obvious in view of the combination of Eriksson et al. and Ramarge et al. As a result, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

In view of the above, the references relied upon in the office action, whether considered alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest patentable features of the claimed invention. Therefore, the references relied upon in the office action, whether considered alone or in combination, do not anticipate the claimed invention or make the claimed invention obvious.

Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejections based upon the cited references.

In conclusion, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this case and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance.

If an interview would advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants respectfully urge the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The undersigned authorizes the Commissioner to charge fee insufficiency and credit overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 22-0261.

Dated: August 28, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Eric J. Franklin/
Eric J. Franklin

Registration No.: 37,134
VENABLE LLP
P.O. Box 34385
Washington, DC 20043-9998
(202) 344-4000
(202) 344-8300 (Fax)
Attorney/Agent For Applicant